

REMARKS

Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated September 19, 2007, Applicants have amended claims 19-21 and 25. Claims 22-24 have been cancelled. Support for amended claim 19 is found in, for example, pg. 10, lines 19-20; and pg. 14, lines 3-6. Support for amended claim 20 is found in, for example, pg. 14, lines 9-11. The limitations of claim 23, previously dependent upon claim 21, have been incorporated into claim 21, and claim 23 cancelled. Support for amended claim 25 is found in, for example, pg. 10, lines 19-21. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter. Claim 25 is withdrawn. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. The Office Action states that claim 23 also includes AI with a NiP embossing surface as one of the alternatives for the embossing tool. The Office Action states that even though not specifically claimed, the Examiner points out that no art fairly suggests NiP surface AI tool. The Office Action further states if this were independently claimed, such a claim would be considered allowable.

In accordance with the Examiner's recommendation, the pertinent limitations of claim 23, previously dependent upon claim 21, have been incorporated into independent claims 19 and 21. Therefore, claims 20 and 26, which depend on amended independent claims 19 and 26, respectively, are also allowable.

Because claims 19 and 21 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above, it is not believed to be necessary to further amend the claims.

Upon the allowance of generic claim 21, Applicants respectfully request the rejoinder, examination, and allowance of dependent claim 25, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.141.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 19, 21-24, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes et al. (WO 99/59036), Mentz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,657), or Nishizaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,663); and claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes et al. (WO 99/59036), Mentz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,657), or Nishizaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,663), and further in view of Belser (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,082).

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot in view of amendment of independent claims 19 and 21.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Application No.: 10/642,265

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Lisa A. Kilday
Registration No. 56,210

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 BKS/LAK
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: January 22, 2008

**Please recognize our Customer No. 49745
as our correspondence address.**

WDC99 1478033-1.050103.0566